



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/182,842	10/29/98	BEHL	S BEHL1318

021366 MM42/0127
LAW OFFICES OF KEVIN H FORTIN
TWIN OAKS OFFICE PLAZA SUITE 112
477 NINTH AVENUE
SAN MATEO CA 94402

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 01/27/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or
proc eding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/182842

Applicant(s)

Behl

Examiner

Abrams

Group Art Unit

2839

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

P r i d f r Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2-16-99 (prelim amdt)
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2839

This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Abstract, numerals in parenthesis should be added. Also, --The carrier may include both offset slots (68, 70) for receiving a pair of cards and an interface connector (72) for external communication. A carrier may also include a fan (66) for cooling the computer. --should be added at the end.

Spec. page 2, line 13 "16" incorrect, page 4, line 16 after "card" --60-- should be added; line 26, a numeral for the "IDE...interface" should be added.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is unclear, the lines 5, 6, "PC card slots" should be tied in with the line 2 opening, since one or both cards are to be inserted through the opening. Claim 4, "couples with" is unclear, should it be --is electrically connected with--.

Claim 7, "plug for the carrier" is unclear, purposes of power connector and pin connector should be more clearly set forth. The computer attached position of the IDE interface, should be set forth, also what figure if any shows the IDE interface. Claim 10, line 2 "a" should be --the--.

Claim 12 is unclear, since the fan embodiment, fig. 3, does not include the "two offset slots" feature.

Art Unit: 2839

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claims 1, 7, 12 structures must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

For claims 1, 7, fig. 2 shows the "carrier", ^(housing, guides, etc.) with only a single slot, fig. 4 shows the "offset slots" feature however these items are not shown in combination and just how they would be joined into one structure is unclear. For claim 12, the "fan" embodiment is not shown together with the "offset slots" embodiment.

Claims 1-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. These claims are based on a non-enabling disclosure.

The "carrier", the "offset slot feature" and the "carrier with fan" are each shown in different embodiments without any disclosure of how these separate embodiments are to be combined. For example just how two cards are to be inserted into the fig. 2 carrier to be received in the fig. 4 slots 68, 70 is unclear, just how the fan is to be included with the combination and how access through the carrier to connector 72 (claim 4) is to be enabled are unclear.

Drawings are also objected to (fig. 2) for failing to clearly depict the carrier due partly to sketch like nature of the figure.

Drawings should also show the claim 7, "IDE interface" and a numeral should be used for the item.

Art Unit: 2839

Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect can be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Cheng.

Fig. 1 shows a docking assembly at 10. It would have been obvious to provide carrier 12 with a fan in view of Cheng at 25.

Claim 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng in view of Darden.

Note Cheng power connector 21 and fan 25. Obvious to use Cheng carrier 20 with a docking assembly like 100 of Darden or like 40 of Darden, the support 40 also being readable as a docking assembly.

Claims 1-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsai ^{taken} alone or in view of admitted prior art, Kazunari, Shieh, Onoda, Darden, Ringer, Adam and Georgopoulos.

Tsai discloses a carrier 1 with a plug 32 for connection to a docking assembly at 4a and with offset slots 211, 212. Obvious that board portion 3a could include "adapter circuitry". Also note that the Tsai tracks 211, 212 are obviously intended for use with two cards as an alternative to HDD 5.

Art Unit: 2839

Should issues arise, obvious to use a docking assembly and handle (claim 6) and lock (claim 14) in view of applicants prior art fig. 1 at 10, etc. as well as Adam at 34 and Darden at 100, 150. Also obvious to use the slots for two card in view of Kazunari, figs. 13, 14, and Ringer, to use a flash card in view of Ringer, col. 1, line 49 to include circuitry on PC board 3 in view of Shieh and Georgopulos, to include an interface pin connector (claim 4) in view of Onoda at 50, 51 and Shieh at 8 and to use a ribbon cable in view of Darden at 73.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kazunari in view of admitted prior art, Tsai, Shieh, Onoda, Cheng, Darden, Ringer, Adam and Georgopulos.

See fig. 14 carrier with offset slots 22, 24. Obvious to provide carrier with a plug in view of Tsai at 32. The prior art (fig. 1) and other references are applied as discussed above.

For claim 7, obvious to use Kazunari, fig. 1 carries with the prior art type docking assembly 10, the Kazunari, fig. 15 type docking assembly 1 or one like 100 of Darden and to include a power connector in view of Darden at 134 and (claim 12) to add a fan in view of Cheng. For claim 10, obvious to include rails as in Kazunari, fig. 15 at 1d.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Darden, Tsai, Kazunari, Shieh, Onoda, Cheng, Ringer, Adam and Georgopulos.

Prior Art fig. 1 includes docking assembly 10. Also obvious to use a docking assembly like 100 of Darden and to form the carrier 12 with offset slots for 1c cards in view of Kazunari,


Art Unit: 2839

fig. 14, Tsai at 211, 212 and Ringer, fig. 4. Secondary references are applied as discussed above.

Also obvious (claim 10) to use rails in view of Darden at 121, 54.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to N. Abrams at
telephone number (703) 308-1729.

Abrams/dc
January 21, 2000


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322